

form including all of the features of the base claims and any intervening claims.

PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13, 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 27, 30, 33-35, 37, 38, 41, 44, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 6,119,179 to Whitridge et al. (hereinafter Whitridge). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 10 recite arranging information within a PDA into a data set including phone policies of a PDA user. Applicant respectfully submits that Whitridge fails to disclose this feature.

Whitridge discloses attaching a PDA to an adapter, which functions as a phone device (column 4, lines 1-43). In particular, Whitridge discloses that all communications work is performed by API programs stored and executed within the adapter. This includes all functions initiating and maintaining the phone features (see column 4, lines 39-46). Whitridge's adapter dictates the phone features being provided, and consequentially, the phone policies used to implement these features. There is no teaching or suggestion in Whitridge that the PDA stores any information about phone policies. Also, Whitridge fails to disclose that the adapter offers features, which are specific to a user. Therefore, Whitridge fails to disclose the step of arranging information

within a PDA into a data set including phone policies of a user, as recited by claims 1 and 10.

Independent claim 13 recites storing sets of phone features and phone policies in a PDA, and verifying phone configurations based on at least one of these sets. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10, Whitridge fails to disclose a PDA, which stores phone policies. Further, Whitridge neither teaches nor suggests the step of verifying phone configurations. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Whitridge fails to anticipate or suggest claim 13.

Independent claims 16, 23, 30, 37, and 44 each recite storing a list of phone policies, and allowing a user to program user's personal phone features using the stored list. As disclosed above with respect to claims 1 and 10, Whitridge fails to disclose anything with respect to storing phone policies in a PDA. Moreover, Whitridge provides no specific disclosure with regard to a user programming phone features or phone policies into the PDA using stored lists. Therefore, independent claims 16, 23, 30, 37, and 44 are not disclosed nor suggested by Whitridge.

Independent claims 27, 41, and 49 recite arranging data within the PDA into a data set including phone policies of a plurality of users, and displaying phone configurations. As described above, Whitridge fails to disclose that the PDA stores information regarding phone policies. Further, Whitridge fails to disclose the step of displaying phone

configurations. Accordingly, none of claims 27, 41, and 29 are disclosed by Whitridge.

Since independent claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 23, 27, 30, 37, 41, 44, and 49 are allowable for the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 5-9, 11, 16, 18-21, 24, 33-35, 38, and 46-48 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on above-mentioned claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration of the various rejections and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.


In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 390-3030 in the Washington, D.C. area, to discuss this application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.

By: _____


Gary D. Yacura
Registration No. 35,416

GDY/JWR

P. O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195